

DU 627

4

T<sub>3</sub>



*ch 26. Dec 6 James A Tawney 1898*  
*H. F. R*

THE ISLANDS OF HAWAII—ARE THEY TO BE A BUTTRESS  
OR A MENACE TO OUR WESTERN COAST?

---

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES A. TAWNEY,

OF MINNESOTA,

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, March 13, 1898.

---

WASHINGTON.

1898.

H. L. S.

68613

# SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES A. TAWNEY.

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 9008) making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department—

Mr. TAWNEY said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The responsibility for precipitating upon this House a discussion of the question of the annexation of the Islands of Hawaii does not rest upon those who favor that proposition. When a member of this House assails the policy of his party or the long-established nonpartisan policy of the Government, he should be able to justify his position by facts or logic and not rely upon the rhythmic eloquence of his tongue. [Applause.]

It was with unusual interest, therefore, that I listened a few days ago to the vigorous assault of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON] upon the policy of his President, his party, and his country respecting that group of beautiful islands, securely anchored in the bosom of the Pacific, now asking that over them we extend the sovereignty and the flag of the United States. In common with my colleagues of the House I expected to hear some cogent reason, some potential argument, in support of his opposition to annexation, but I listened in vain.

Under the authority of the Constitution, and following the leadership of Webster, Legare, Clayton, Grant, Seward, Blaine, and Harrison, and in obedience to the platform of his party, President McKinley has accepted these islands, freely tendered to us by competent authority. The gentleman from Indiana contents himself with a vigorous denunciation of this policy. He proposes nothing in its stead. He even denies that Hawaii would be of any value to the United States, either commercially or as a strategic point of military advantage.

The logic of his position is the absolute abandonment of the islands or it is nothing. In this respect the speech of the gentleman does not meet the question presented to the people by this treaty of annexation. He told us it would be unwise, and even suggested that it would endanger our national unity to annex Hawaii, but he failed to tell us what the effect of his policy of abandonment would be. Nor did he inform us how we could, with honorable consistency, enforce the policy of not allowing any other power to control or interfere with them if we do not consider them of sufficient importance to accept them ourselves. These are questions of the highest importance and worthy of the most careful consideration, but the opponents of annexation entirely ignore them.

AMERICAN INTERESTS PROMPTED THE POLICY OF NONINTERFERENCE.

Ever since Hawaii was of sufficient importance to be a factor in international politics, all American statesmen and all political parties have regarded its commercial and military advantages of such peculiar value to the United States that they deemed it

necessary to adopt and enforce the policy of not allowing any foreign power to interfere with, control, or colonize it.

As far back as December 31, 1842, President Tyler, in a special message to the Senate relating to these islands, said:

It can not but be in conformity with the interest and wishes of the Government and the people of the United States that this community \* \* \* should be respected, and all its rights strictly and conscientiously regarded. \* \* \* Far remote from the dominions of European powers, its growth and prosperity as an independent state may yet be in high degree useful to all whose trade is extended to those regions, while its near approach to this continent, and the intercourse which American vessels have with it—such vessels constituting five-sixths of all which annually visit it—could not but create dissatisfaction on the part of the United States at any attempt by another power, should such attempt be threatened or feared, to take possession of the islands, colonize them, and subvert the native Government.

December 19, 1842, when Hawaii applied to the United States for recognition, Secretary of State Webster said that the matter had been submitted to the President (Tyler) and—

The President is of opinion that the interests of all the commercial nations require that that Government [Hawaii] shall not be interfered with by foreign powers. \* \* \* The United States \* \* \* are more interested in the fate of the islands and of their Government than any other nation can be, and this consideration induces the President to be quite willing to declare, as the sense of the Government of the United States, that the Government of the Sandwich Islands ought to be respected; that no power ought either to take possession of the islands as a conquest or for the purpose of colonization, and that no power ought to seek for any undue control over the existing Government, or any exclusive privileges or preferences in matters of commerce.

H. S. LEGARE ADVOCATED FORCE TO KEEP EUROPEAN POWERS OUT.

June 13, 1843, Secretary of State Legare sent a dispatch to Edward Everett, United States minister at London, in which the relations of the United States to Hawaii are mentioned, by reason of the then recent seizure of the islands by England. In this connection he says:

It is well known that \* \* \* we have no wish to plant or to acquire colonies abroad. Yet there is something so entirely peculiar in the relations between this little commonwealth Hawaii and ourselves that we might even feel justified, consistently with our own principles, in interfering by force to prevent its falling into the hands of one of the great powers of Europe. These relations spring out of the local situation, the history and the character and institutions of the Hawaiian Islands, as well as out of the declarations formally made by this Government during the course of the last session of Congress, to which I beg leave to call your particular attention.

If the attempt now making by ourselves, as well as other Christian powers, to open the markets of China to a more general commerce be successful, there can be no doubt but that a great part of the commerce will find its way over the Isthmus. In that event it will be impossible to overrate the importance of the Hawaiian group as a stage in the long voyage between Asia and America. But without anticipating events which, however, seem inevitable and even approaching, the actual demands of an immense navigation make the free use of these roadsteads and ports indispensable to us. \* \* \* It seems doubtful whether even the undisputed possession of the Oregon Territory and the use of the Columbia River, or, indeed, anything short of the acquisition of California, if that were possible, would be sufficient indemnity to us for the loss of these harbors.—*Report of Senate Committee on Foreign Relations concerning Hawaiian Islands*, volume 2, page 921.

Upon receipt of a communication from Mr. Severance, American minister at Honolulu, informing him of the persistent attempts on the part of the French Government to take these islands, Secretary of State Webster, on June 18, 1851, again addressed United States Minister Rives at Paris, instructing him to immediately inform the French Government that the further enforcement of the French demand against Hawaii—

Would be tantamount to a subjugation of the islands to the dominion of France. A step like this could not fail to be viewed by the Government and people of the United States with a dissatisfaction which would tend seriously to disturb our existing friendly relations with the French Government.

REPARATION REQUESTED FOR HAWAII, INDICATING CLAIM OF UNITED STATES OF RIGHT TO PROTECT HAWAII.

And he is further instructed to make such representations to France—

As will induce that Government to desist from measures incompatible with the sovereignty and independence of the Hawaiian Islands, and to make amends for the acts which the French agents have already committed there in contravention of the law of nations and of the treaty between the Hawaiian Government and France.

UNITED STATES CAN NEVER CONSENT TO OCCUPATION BY, OR HOSTILE DEMANDS OF, EUROPEAN POWERS.

[John M. Clayton.]

In a dispatch from Secretary Clayton to United States Minister Rives at Paris, July 5, 1850, referring to the differences between the French and Hawaiian governments, he made the following statement:

The Department will be slow to believe that the French have any intention to adopt, with reference to the Sandwich Islands, the same policy which they have pursued in regard to Tahiti. If, however, in your judgment, it should be warranted by circumstances, you may take a proper opportunity to intimate to the minister for foreign affairs of France that the situation of the Sandwich Islands in respect to our possessions on the Pacific and the bonds, commercial and of other descriptions, between them and the United States are such that we can never with indifference allow them to pass under the dominion or exclusive control of any other power.

Secretary of State Webster, replying to United States Minister Severance, at Honolulu, on July 14, 1851, says, after reciting that the demands of France were improper and "could only end in rendering the islands and their government a prey to the stronger commercial nations of the world:"

It can not be expected that the Government of the United States could look on a course of things leading to such a result with indifference.

The Hawaiian Islands are ten times nearer to the United States than to any of the powers of Europe. Five-sixths of all their commercial intercourse is with the United States, and these considerations, together with others of a more general character, have fixed the course which the Government of the United States will pursue in regard to them. The annunciation of this policy will not surprise the governments of Europe, nor be thought to be unreasonable by the nations of the civilized world, and that policy is that while the Government of the United States, itself faithful to its original assurance, scrupulously regards the independence of the Hawaiian Islands, it can never consent to see those islands taken possession of by either of the great commercial powers of Europe, nor can it consent that demands manifestly unjust and derogatory and inconsistent with a bona fide independence shall be enforced against that Government.—*Report Senate Committee on Foreign Relations concerning Hawaiian Islands*, volume 2, page 908.

HAWAII THE KEY OF THE AMERICAN PACIFIC.

[James G. Blaine.]

In 1881, the British Government having made certain demands upon the Hawaiian Government arising out of the reciprocity treaty with the United States negotiated in 1876, Mr. Blaine, in a dispatch dated December 1, 1881, to United States Minister Comly at Honolulu, used the following language:

This Government firmly believes that the position of the Hawaiian Islands as the key to the dominion of the American Pacific demands their benevolent neutrality, to which end it will earnestly cooperate with the native Government. And if, through any cause, the maintenance of such a position of benevolent neutrality should be found by Hawaii to be impracticable, this Government would then unhesitatingly meet the altered situation by seeking an avowedly American solution for the grave issues presented.—*Report Senate Committee on Foreign Relations concerning Hawaiian Islands*, volume 2, page 831.



In a further dispatch he said:

The Government of the United States \* \* \* has always avowed, and now repeats, that under no circumstances will it permit the transfer of the territory or sovereignty of these islands to any of the great European powers. It is needless to restate the reasons upon which that determination rests. It is too obvious for argument that the possession of these islands by a great maritime power would not only be a dangerous diminution of the just and necessary influence of the United States in the waters of the Pacific, but in the case of international difficulty it would be a positive threat to interests too large and important to be lightly risked.

Since 1842 nine Presidents have declared and enforced this policy of noninterference. Recognizing the value of their advantages to us and the necessity for continuing this policy, it was declared in substance by both Houses of Congress, within the past four years, that any interference in the affairs of the Hawaiian Islands by any foreign power would be considered as an unfriendly act toward this Government.

Notwithstanding the ability of those who inaugurated this policy; notwithstanding its persistent enforcement by all political parties, and by the foremost statesmen in the last half of the nineteenth century, and notwithstanding all these men saw that the fruit of their policy would be the ultimate annexation of the islands, the gentleman from Indiana tells us the proposition of annexation is a "mere bauble."

He would not only reject annexation, but the logic of his position forces him to favor the abandonment of that policy which Webster, Clayton, Seward, and Blaine all, in effect, said was necessary to avoid a dangerous diminution of the just and essential influence of the United States in the waters of the North Pacific Ocean, and, in case of international difficulty, to protect interests on that coast too large and important to be lightly risked.

The reason for the policy of noninterference is so fully and forcibly stated in a confidential dispatch to United States Minister Comly, at Honolulu, December 1, 1881, written by Mr. Blaine, that I feel justified in reading a portion of the same for the information of the committee:

#### HAWAII'S RELATIONS TO THE UNITED STATES—EARLY EXTINCTION OF NATIVES—TRANSFER OF POWER TO OTHERS.

In my formal instruction of this date I have reviewed the general question of relationship between the United States and the Hawaiian Islands, and the position of the latter, both as an integral part of the American system and as the key to the commerce of the North Pacific.

As that instruction was written for communication to the Hawaiian secretary of state, I touched but lightly on the essential question of the gradual and seemingly inevitable decadence and extinction of the native race and its replacement by another, to which the powers of government would necessarily descend.

A single glance at the census returns of Hawaii for half a generation past exhibits this alarming diminution of the indigenous element, amounting to 1½ per cent per annum of the population. Meanwhile the industrial and productive development of Hawaii is on the increase, and the native classes, never sufficiently numerous to develop the full resources of the islands, have been supplemented by an adventitious labor element from China mainly, until the rice and sugar fields are largely tilled by aliens. The worst of this state of things is that it must inevitably keep on in increasing ratio, the native classes growing smaller, the insular production larger, and the immigration to supply the want of labor greater every year.

#### HAWAII COMMERCIALLY A DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA.

I have shown in a previous instruction how entirely Hawaii is a part of the productive and commercial system of the American States. So far as the staple growths and imports of the islands go, the reciprocity treaty makes them practically members of an American zolverein, an outlying district of the State of California. So far as political structure and independence of action are concerned, Hawaii is as remote from our control as China.

## PERPETUITY OF NATIVES BASIS OF INDEPENDENCE.

This contradiction is only explicable by assuming what is the fact, that thirty years ago, having the choice between material annexation and commercial assimilation of the islands, the United States chose the less responsible alternative. The soundness of the choice, however, entirely depends upon the perpetuity of the rule of the native race as an independent government, and that imperiled, the whole framework of our relations to Hawaii is changed, if not destroyed.

The decline of the native Hawaiian element in the presence of newer and steadier growths must be accepted as an inevitable fact, in view of the teachings of ethnological history. And as retrogression in the development of the islands can not be admitted without serious detriment to American interests in the North Pacific, the problem of a replenishment of the vital forces of Hawaii presents itself for intelligent solution in an American sense, not in an Asiatic or British sense.

## ANNEXATION WOULD CAUSE AMERICAN COLONIZATION.

There is little doubt that were the Hawaiian Islands, by annexation or district protection, a part of the territory of the Union, their fertile resources for the growth of rice and sugar would not only be controlled by American capital, but so profitable a field of labor would attract intelligent workers thither from the United States.

Throughout the continent, north and south, wherever a foothold is found for American enterprise, it is quickly occupied, and this spirit of adventure, which seeks its outlet in the mines of South America and the railroads of Mexico, would not be slow to avail itself of openings for assured and profitable enterprise even in mid ocean.—*Report Senate Committee on Foreign Relations concerning Hawaiian Islands*, volume 2, page 977.

It is significant that all the conditions here recited by Mr. Blaine, which in his judgment would justify and make annexation necessary, have now come to pass. The gentleman from Indiana may say Mr. Blaine was a jingo, and therefore a dangerous leader in foreign affairs. Whatever he may have been in this respect, his wisdom as a statesman, his Americanism, and his unselfish devotion to the interests of the people no man dare question.

I firmly believe, Mr. Chairman, we would show infinitely more wisdom in following on this question the judgment of James G. Blaine than we would in following at this time the jingoism of the gentleman from Indiana in matters of currency reform. Jingoism is not confined exclusively to our foreign policy.

## SHALL WE ANNEX OR ABANDON HAWAII?

Until recently this policy of noninterference with the Islands of Hawaii has been courteously acquiesced in by all foreign nations. During this time, it is true, the independent Government of Hawaii has been interfered with, and it was even attempted to take the islands by force, once by Great Britain, twice by France, and once by Russia. But on each occasion the prompt enforcement of our policy prevented them from falling permanently into the hands of either of these great powers.

Now, however, a different proposition confronts us. The question is not should we or may we continue our policy of noninterference, with the islands under the control of an independent government, or annex them? The question is: Shall we annex or abandon them? If we refuse to annex them, by what right could we enforce any policy whatever respecting them, as against the right of Hawaii to go wheresoever it pleases? By rejecting them we are estopped from ever thereafter exercising any control over them as against the will of their government or the action of any foreign power. We can not let them go and hold them at the same time. [Applause.]



OVERTHROW OF EXISTING GOVERNMENT OR ANNEXATION BY SOME FOREIGN  
POWER INEVITABLE.

Three-fourths of the property is owned by those who practically control the Republic. Their numerical weakness and the peculiar political conditions and factional differences growing out of the desire on the part of the aliens to see their native country in control or possessing advantages inimical to the interests of the United States is a constant menace to the stability and perpetuity of the Government, and therefore dangerous to the property interests of those who control the Republic. Another serious and constantly threatening danger is Oriental colonization, whereby control will ultimately be obtained without any overt act on the part of the government obtaining it.

The authority of the existing Government to tender the islands to any foreign power is conceded. If we reject them, that rejection of necessity carries with it an acknowledgment of the right on the part of the Republic of Hawaii to determine its own political destiny, uninfluenced by considerations affecting the United States. In that event, knowing the dangers, both internal and external, which threaten property interests and the stability of the Government, they will seek elsewhere, as a matter of self-preservation, annexation with a people whose representatives are influenced by broad national interests rather than by corporate greed.

In that event, tell me, pray, on what ground can the United States consistently interfere? On none whatever. I repeat, therefore, the question is not, Shall we continue the present status or annex these islands; it is, Shall we annex them or abandon them?

POPULATION HETEROGENEOUS.

It is true, as the gentleman from Indiana says, the population is heterogeneous in character; but so is the population of his and almost every other State in the Union. It is not true, however, that the native Hawaiians are an illiterate race.

The percentage of illiteracy, according to the Hawaiian census of 1896, is only a very little more among the natives of these islands than it is in the State of Indiana. I was surprised when there a short time ago to learn that it was almost impossible to find an adult native who could not read and write, and more than one-third of them read and write the English language.

In 1843 the school work of the islands was considered of sufficient importance to be organized as a separate department of the Government, and was then placed in charge of a cabinet minister. As a result of the educational policy of the Government, the English language has been taught for many years in all the public and select schools, and to-day education there is universal, compulsory, and free.

The population of the islands is made up of Hawaiian, American, British, German, Portuguese, Chinese, Japanese, and other nationalities. The total number of the population in 1896, the date of the last census, was 109,020. Of these 31,019 were full-blooded Hawaiians, 23,038 were Americans and Europeans, 24,407 were Japanese, 21,616 Chinese, and 455 were South Sea Islanders. The remainder, 8,485, were part Hawaiians.

SELF-GOVERNMENT FOR THE HAWAIIAN A THING OF THE PAST.

As the result of causes which I have not the time to discuss, the native population has diminished to less than one-third of the total inhabitants. The question is no longer, Shall the Hawaiians

be self-governed? Self-government is, for these people, a thing of the past. It is inevitable that in the near future some foreign power will dominate their Government.

The question which confronts them and us is, Which foreign power shall it be? The gentleman from Indiana would answer, any foreign power but the United States. With this exception, the solution of this question is a matter of supreme indifference to him, and to all those who are opposed to annexation. This is un-American, unpatriotic, because it involves the complete abandonment of our commercial and military interests in these islands, the preservation of which the greatest American statesmen, soldiers, and naval authorities have deemed and now believe to be absolutely essential to the development of our commerce on the Pacific in times of peace, and in times of international difficulties to the protection of those great American interests in that rapidly growing section of our country on the western slope of the Rocky Mountains.

For myself, and I believe I but voice the sentiment of the great majority of the people when I say, I would meet this question as James G. Blaine, in 1881, proposed to meet it. It was then feared that the neutrality of the islands was no longer practicable, and Mr. Blaine said:

This Government would then unhesitatingly meet the altered situation by seeking an avowedly American solution for the grave issues presented.

#### Meaning annexation.

##### ONLY UNRECONSTRUCTED ROYALISTS OPPOSED TO ANNEXATION.

The gentleman tells us that he is opposed to annexation because he "believes the people of Hawaii are opposed to it." He is also opposed to it because it would be a radical departure from the alleged traditional policy of our Government and establish a dangerous precedent for the future acquisition of insular territory, and also because it might involve our Government in international difficulties.

On a petition purporting to be signed by fifteen or twenty thousand people out of a total population of 109,000, he tells us the people are against annexation.

The pending treaty was first negotiated by the Executives of the two Governments. Since then it has been duly ratified by the Senate of Hawaii, a body elected by the people, not by the states. I risk nothing when I say that if our Senate, like that of Hawaii, was elected by the people the treaty would long since have been ratified and the Islands of Hawaii would now be a part of the United States.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TAWNEY. My time is very limited.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the gentleman please state to the House how many people of Hawaii are allowed to vote to elect that senate out there?

Mr. HOPKINS. More than some in the Southern States. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I live in Missouri, and in that State every man votes and gets his vote counted.

Mr. TAWNEY. I think I will answer the gentleman in just a moment in my remarks.

When in the history of our Republic have we refused to annex territory because we believed a part of the people in that territory

were opposed to it? When have we ever demanded, as a condition precedent to annexation, a popular vote in our own or in the country it was proposed to annex? Neither the Constitution nor the laws of this country or of Hawaii require it. On the contrary, the constitutions of both countries, that of the United States in general terms and that of Hawaii in express terms, authorize the Presidents and Senates of both countries to conclude a treaty of annexation.

During the past fifty years there have been four annexation treaties negotiated by Hawaii with the United States—one in 1851; another in 1854, which would have been ratified and confirmed by both countries but for the sudden death of Kamehameha III; another in 1893, and the fourth in 1897. Two of these were negotiated by the monarchy, one by the Provisional Government, and one by the Republic of Hawaii; and in neither case was there any provision for a popular vote, either in the United States or in Hawaii.

This ground of the gentleman's opposition is not, therefore, based on any legal right possessed by those in Hawaii who oppose annexation. It can only be founded on a sentimental regard for the native Hawaiian. If the philanthropists would descend from their ethereal abode long enough to ascertain the facts, they would find that, almost without exception, all the ministers of the gospel, most of the better educated natives, all the boards of foreign and domestic missions, the practical educators, and those who have contributed years of their time, energy, and means to the Hawaiian people, who feel that their future welfare is a trust too sacred to be sacrificed upon the altar of Mongolian supremacy—all these are earnestly working and praying for the success of the treaty of annexation as their only hope for the native Hawaiian.

RESTORATION OF THE MONARCHY THE HOPE OF THE NATIVES WHO OPPOSE ANNEXATION.

From personal conversation with some of the most intelligent natives, I am confident if you could overcome the fear, entertained by some of the leading Hawaiians, of the loss of social position as a result of annexation, you would then have removed one of the principal causes of their opposition. It is a significant fact that most of the natives who oppose annexation are those who have, thus far, refused to renounce allegiance to the monarchy and become citizens of the existing Republic.

They not only oppose annexation, but they desire, and many of them have recently been found secretly plotting for, the overthrow of the Republic and the reestablishment of the monarchy. They hope to see the monarchy restored if annexation fails, and they fear the loss of social position if it succeeds. This has enabled a few of the leading native Hawaiians, men and women, in the public meetings which have been held all over the islands, to appeal to the patriotism and prejudices of their countrymen and thereby secure their formal protest against annexation. Analyze the petition of which the gentleman speaks, and you will find that not only names of children not over 2 years of age are upon it, but that more than four-fifths of those who have signed it are unreconstructed royalists.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him one other question? Is it not true that the list of voters in Hawaii, which was 16,000 under the monarchy, has been cut down to 2,000 under the oligarchy, and that a property qualification attaches to it?

Mr. TAWNEY. It has not been cut down at all. Every one of them who will come in and renounce allegiance to the monarchy and take the oath of allegiance to the existing Government becomes a citizen under the constitution and is entitled to vote.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. You did not answer the last half of the question. Is there not a property qualification?

Mr. TAWNEY. For the purpose of holding office, but not for the purpose of voting.

Further answering the question of the gentleman, I will say that the registered voters of Hawaii never numbered 16,000 under the monarchy. The facts are that the registration of voters at the last election under the monarchy was, in round numbers, 11,000, and the actual vote cast 9,500.

The number of those who have taken the oath of allegiance to the Republic, which is a prerequisite to voting, is approximately 6,000.

Every man who could vote under the monarchy can vote under the Republic upon the one condition that he renounce allegiance to the monarchy and swear allegiance to the Republic.

There is no property qualification required of voters for representatives. The only requirement in their case is the ability to read and write and that their taxes shall have been paid. Voters for senators are required in addition thereto to own real estate worth \$1,500 or to earn an income of \$50 a month.

This property qualification is the same that it was under the monarchy, except that then the ownership of \$3,000 worth of real estate was required; but the constitutional convention of 1894 reduced the amount to \$1,500.

There has been no discrimination either in theory or practice against native Hawaiians as electors, government officers, or members of the legislature. Those who assert to the contrary are either ignorant of the facts or willful perverters of the truth.

A majority of the voters who have qualified under the Republic are pure-blood native Hawaiians.

A majority of the members of the first legislature elected under the Republic were pure-blood native Hawaiians, and elected a native speaker. This house voluntarily, at two successive sessions of the legislature, unanimously passed resolutions approving annexation to the United States, and a new legislature just elected, containing slightly less than a majority of natives, has elected a native speaker, and, with one exception, was elected on a straight annexation platform.

Three-fourths of the police force of Honolulu, including captains and subordinate officials, are native Hawaiians; and almost all the police officers in the country districts are natives.

Throughout the Government departments the majority of offices are held by natives, and, other things being equal, the policy of the Government is to give them the preference.

In no other country and under no other Government is any colored race treated with the liberality and full equality accorded the native Hawaiians, politically and socially, in the Republic of Hawaii.

#### ANNEXATION NOT OPPOSED TO TRADITIONAL POLICY OF OUR GOVERNMENT.

Instead of annexation being contrary to the traditional policy of our Government, it would be entirely in harmony with that policy. The policy of annexing insular territory has obtained since 1856. It is based upon a statute passed August 18 of that year. Under it Congress has not only approved of the annexation



of insular territory, but seventy islands and groups of islands—the names and dates of their annexation I can give if necessary—have been annexed to the United States, exclusive of the Aleutian Islands. Fifty-seven of these are in the Pacific Ocean and thirteen in the Caribbean Sea.

But gentlemen may say these were annexed for the guano they contain. That may be and doubtless is true with respect to some of them; but that does not change the fact that we have made this insular territory a part of our domain and that to enjoy its advantages we are bound to protect it.

If it is wise and expedient to annex insular territory to fertilize American soil, in the name of God, how can you consistently refuse to annex similar territory to protect American people? The protection of our interests in the Pacific Ocean and on the coast of that sea should be regarded everywhere of as much importance as the fertilization of our soil. [Applause.]

Another important fact bearing on this branch of the question is the annexation, in 1867, of the Island of Midway, and the appropriation of \$50,000 by Congress for the improvement of its harbor and to convert it into a naval station. This island is about 1,100 miles west of Honolulu. It belongs to the Hawaiian group. After the destruction of a vessel on its reefs, the attempt to make it a naval station was abandoned, but the island remains the property of the United States.

Has its annexation, or the annexation of the Aleutian Islands, or any of the seventy islands annexed heretofore, involved us in international difficulties? Did their annexation or the annexation of Alaska conflict less with the alleged traditional policy of our Government than would the annexation of the Hawaiian islands? The only traditional policy of our Government has been to annex any territory deemed essential to the growth and development of our country and to the protection of that which we possessed, whether contiguous or insular.

Is the policy of the Government concerning the annexation of territory affected by the motive which prompted the annexation? No; the motive goes only to the question of expediency. It does not change or affect its policy. Therefore, if it has been our policy to annex insular territory for any purpose, the annexation of the Islands of Hawaii, no matter what the motive, would not be a violation of that policy nor would it constitute a precedent, for the precedent has long since been established.

ANNEXATION WOULD PREVENT, NOT CAUSE, INTERNATIONAL DIFFICULTIES.

The gentleman does not tell us how the annexation of these islands would involve the United States in international difficulties. His position on this branch of the question is absolutely untenable. As long as Hawaii remains an independent Republic, without the power to permanently maintain its independence, with the constant strife between the aliens for political control, it will be an incubator of international difficulties, inviting international intrigue and friction, and be a constant menace to the peace and prosperity of the Pacific.

Annexation would eliminate these islands from the realm of international politics as completely as the territory of Texas and California was when annexed. These islands being, then, a part of the United States, its authority and control would be respected accordingly by the inhabitants and by all the great powers of the world whose commercial and military interests in the Pacific Ocean are constantly and rapidly increasing.



AMERICAN INTERESTS TOO GREAT TO BE SACRIFICED BY AMERICAN REPRESENTATIVES.

Mr. Chairman, when we consider the great possibilities of American commerce on the Pacific, when we consider that in less than a half century the principal outlet for our surplus agricultural and manufactured products west of the Mississippi will be across that mighty sea to the new oriental world, just awakening to its commercial and other material advantages and necessities, and if we also consider the important physical relation of Hawaii to this magnificent future development, it seems impossible that a representative of the American people should favor the abandonment of these islands to the selfish greed of some foreign power by opposing their annexation, and that, too, upon ground purely sentimental.

While their importance to our commerce, their conceded strategical advantage, and the protection their possession would afford our Pacific coast are each of themselves sufficient to justify annexation, yet there is still another important consideration too frequently ignored and too little appreciated. It is the trade and commerce between these islands and the Pacific coast States, and the extent to which this would be increased under the influence of annexation.

THE GEOGRAPHY OF THE ISLANDS AND THEIR PRINCIPAL PRODUCTS.

Hawaii consists of eight inhabited islands, extending from northwest to southeast over a distance of about 380 miles. The area is, approximately, 7,000 square miles, almost equal to that of Massachusetts, or about 600 square miles greater than that of Connecticut and Rhode Island combined. The soil consists entirely of decomposed lava, and in productiveness equals the soil of any other country in the world. The chief products are sugar, coffee, rice, bananas, pineapples, guavas, and many other tropical fruits. There are on the islands 59 sugar plantations and about 250 coffee plantations.

The cultivation of coffee is rapidly increasing and will soon rival sugar in amount and value. On the island of Hawaii alone there are between four and five hundred thousand acres of rich land peculiarly adapted to the raising of coffee, but not available for sugar. With these islands a part of the United States, American industry and enterprise would, in the near future, produce a very large part of the coffee we consume, and in time make us practically independent of the world for all the staple articles of American consumption.

A TRIP FROM HILO TO KILAUEA.

On the 16th of September last a small party, consisting of four members of this House, including myself, was driven from Hilo, on the Island of Hawaii, a distance of 31 miles, to where the slumbering volcano Kilauea spouts his lava fountain into the air. The road, built by the Government, and almost like a paved street, wound through a native tropical forest, whose rich foliage and inexhaustible vegetation, together with the many thriving sugar and coffee plantations along the way, attested the fertility of the soil and foreshadowed the future possibilities of the islands to those who may desire to engage in the pursuit of agriculture.

Fern trees, trees of a bread fruit and cocoanut, alligator pears, bananas, guavas, palms, and pineapples; everywhere and over all the thick climbing vines clung to the trunks or hung in festoons over them, making the forest dark and apparently impenetrable. Wild strawberries, gooseberries, and raspberries grow

there in rich profusion; fruits of all kinds, in all stages of growth, from early green to mellow ripeness, hung upon the vines or trees, for there seasons are unknown. The air never rises above 90 degrees and never sinks below 53, except upon the mountains.

These islands boast the highest mountains of any island in any sea. You can enjoy perpetual summer, spring, autumn, or winter, according to the elevation you choose. The gentlest of breezes blow the whole year round across this land of perennial summer. The conditions of happy existence on these wondrous islands surpass your power to believe as much as they surpass my power to describe. In this haven of rest one may with perfect sanity long to tarry. Here, if anywhere, we might—

Swear an oath and keep it with  
An equal mind,  
In the fertile lotus land to live and  
Lie reclined,  
On the hills like gods together,  
Careless of mankind.

[Applause.]

#### OPPORTUNITIES FOR A PROFITABLE AS WELL AS HAPPY EXISTENCE.

But, sir, the natural conditions upon these islands afford opportunities for a profitable as well as happy existence. Their foreign trade exceeds in value \$208 per capita for every man, woman, and child in the country—a record unparalleled in the history of the world. There are no poorhouses in Hawaii. Paupers, beggars, and tramps are found there only in the recollection of those who in some other country have seen them or have had occasion to deal with them; otherwise these living examples of poverty, wretchedness, and misfortune are unknown to the people there. Their cities and villages possess all modern conveniences and afford every comfort enjoyed by the people of any city in the United States.

In 1896 the Pacific Coast States sold to the people of Hawaii more than \$800,000 worth of food products. The total imports for that year exceeded \$7,000,000, almost \$5,500,000 coming from the United States. The value of their exports for the same year exceeded \$15,000,000, leaving a net balance of trade in their favor of over \$8,000,000. Of the countries which received exports from San Francisco during the year ending October 30, 1896, Hawaii stands second. These islands were our second best purchaser of wines, our third best of barley, and our sixth best of flour. To-day they are the largest consumer of United States products of any single country bordering on the Pacific.

#### TRADE BETWEEN THE PACIFIC COAST AND THESE ISLANDS GREATLY INCREASED BY ANNEXATION.

The harbor of Honolulu is the only harbor in the world where for many years the American flag has floated over more vessels than all other flags together. [Applause.] The number of American vessels entering American ports during the year ending June 30, 1896, were: From the United Kingdom, 88; from Europe, Asia, Africa, and Australia combined, 210; from Hawaii alone, 191.

These islands, therefore, furnish cargo for 191 American vessels, and all the world besides, except the American continent, furnish cargo for only 298.

If, with a heterogeneous population, numbering only 109,000 souls, with an unstable government to deter capital, and retard development and production, and with a restricted market in this country for the sale of all but three of their principal products,

Hawaii is the principal western consumer of our products and furnishes cargo for more American vessels than all the world besides, except this continent, what splendid possibilities there are for the growth of our trade and commerce with that country when it has become a part of the United States, with the million and a half souls or more which it is capable of supporting, with an American tariff to restrict importations, with a free market in this country for the sale of all its products, with a soil and climate unexcelled in productiveness anywhere in the world, and with a free, stable government to bless the land like a benediction. [Applause.]

THE NATURAL MARKET OF THE FUTURE FOR OUR SURPLUS PRODUCTS.

The commercial and industrial revolution now going on in the far-off Orient dates from the opening of the ports of Japan by Commodore Perry in 1853 with the battle ships of the United States. Then the foreign commerce of this and other countries bordering on the Pacific and Indian oceans was of little or no consequence to the rest of the world. To-day it amounts to over \$2,250,000,000 annually. Although the influence and power of the United States has been a potent factor in this marvelous development, yet our share of its benefit is infinitesimal when compared with that enjoyed by the people of other countries.

Over 80 per cent of our exports go eastward across the Atlantic, and only about 5 per cent westward across the Pacific. More than one-half the world's population inhabit the countries tributary to these two great oceans, excluding this continent. Opportunities for the disposition of our surplus products, especially of the Western States, must keep pace with the increase of production, and it is to the western world that we must look for these increased opportunities to extend our trade.

But we first owe to the present and to future generations the duty of securing permanently every facility for carrying these products across the Pacific to our natural and some day our principal customers. Owing to the great distance, the one thing absolutely essential in this regard is a supply and repair station and a harbor of refuge for our vessels somewhere in that ocean. The only available spot for this purpose is Hawaii.

Their importance in this respect must be apparent to everyone who will stop to consider the fact that to-day all but one of the eight steamship lines now plying between our continent and Japan, China, and Australia are obliged to make use of Hawaii as a way station. Nowhere else on the route traversed by these vessels can they obtain a ton of coal, a gallon of fresh water, or a pound of bread. The distance from Hongkong to Panama is 9,580 miles, a distance equaled only by the combined width of the American continent, the Atlantic Ocean, the Mediterranean, and Turkey, clear across to the boundary of Persia. The distance from Hongkong to San Francisco is more than 5,800 miles, a distance which the width of this continent and the Atlantic Ocean combined does not equal. And the distance from Yokohama to San Francisco exceeds 4,500 miles.

Let us suppose, sir, that the width of the Atlantic Ocean equaled that of the Pacific; that the distance from Liverpool to Panama was 9,580 miles, and from the same place to New York 5,800 miles; that there were no islands in the Atlantic Ocean from the equator to Greenland or from the eastern to the western coast of that sea, except a group similar to those of Hawaii; that they were situated 2,100 miles southeast from New York, forming the



crossroads for American and European commerce; that there was no other spot on this long ocean voyage where it was possible for a vessel to obtain coal or other supplies; that these islands were under the control of an independent government too weak to maintain itself; that this Government freely tendered these islands to the United States, with the knowledge on our part that if we did not accept them they would fall into the hands of some foreign power, how many Representatives from the Atlantic Coast States or from the Atlantic Seaboard cities would, under these circumstances, dare to vote against their annexation and thereby abandon them either to the selfish greed or material welfare of some foreign power? Not one. [Applause.]

You would all then see the advantages that would accrue to your coast and to the whole country from the possession of these islands. The commercial interests which you represent upon this floor would insist upon your accepting them. The menace to your coast, if they were in the possession of some foreign power, would demand of you their acceptance. And yet this is exactly the situation with respect to the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands in the Pacific Ocean. They bear the same relation to the present and future commerce of the Western States and to the protection of the Pacific Coast that they would bear to your commerce on the Atlantic in the case which I have supposed.

#### EFFECTIVENESS OF THE MODERN NAVY DEPENDENT UPON COAL.

The effectiveness of the modern navy depends as much upon coal as it does upon powder. Without the one the other is useless, and with neither the modern battle ship is a thing of beauty but as harmless as a dove. No naval vessel afloat to-day, sailing at an average speed of 15 knots an hour, has sufficient capacity to store coal enough to cross the Pacific or to steam from any existing or possible naval station to our Pacific coast and return again. And when we consider that in the Pacific, from the equator to Bering Sea and from China to the American coast, there is but one spot where recoaling is possible, and that spot is Hawaii, the importance of our possessing these islands reaches a magnitude that overshadows and dwarfs into insignificance every conceivable objection that can be urged against their annexation.

Their value to the United States in this respect will far exceed the value of any fortifications we may erect along the Pacific coast for the purpose of defense, and their possession will also render unnecessary fortifications that otherwise must be erected at enormous expense.

With these islands in our possession, no power having an existing or possible naval station in the Pacific as a basis of operation could attempt an attack upon our western coast; to do so would be a practical impossibility. But place them in the hands of any foreign power, and that power, then only four days' distant from that coast, becomes a most formidable menace to our commerce on the Pacific, and our western coast would then be the most vulnerable point in our nation's coat of mail.

It may be said that in any event certain foreign powers can take South America or British Columbia as a basis of operations; but when we consider the nearness of these countries to the United States, and the comparative ease with which American armies could invade that territory, this suggestion becomes impracticable. Only at enormous expense, and at the risk of being anticipated, could any foreign power undertake it.



## HAWAII THE KEY TO THE PACIFIC.

No wonder, then, that for more than a half century these islands have been regarded by statesmen and naval authorities as the key to the North Pacific, or that our Government has persistently maintained its policy of noninterference.

The audible rumblings on the other side of the Atlantic should warn us that the spirit of national aggrandizement, of territorial acquisition, and greed of commercial power is abroad in that land. The eyes of the world and the navies of the principal nations of Europe are now turned toward the far-off land of the Celestials. The importance of Hawaii to the great interests of European countries in that part of the world would promptly demand its annexation if we did not consider it worth having.

To reject these islands under these circumstances, sir, would be a crime against the American people. Their possession by any foreign power would give to that power an advantage in the Pacific Ocean that would inevitably retard the growth of our commerce on that sea and be a perpetual menace to that imperial domain lying in the morning shadows of the Rocky Mountains.

The fruit of the policy inaugurated by Webster and Tyler, and so long maintained by all political parties, is now ripe. It is ready to drop from the tree planted by the hands of American statesmen. We must accept it or allow it to fall into the hands of some other power.

Following, therefore, the teachings of that enlightened, patriotic American statesmanship which, to promote the general welfare of the people and to insure the preservation of the Republic, has in the past acquired territory, whether contiguous or insular, we should ratify and confirm the far-seeing judgment and intelligent action of President McKinley, thereby throwing around these islands the shield of American sovereignty and planting upon them that starry emblem of liberty, thus warning the nations of the world that the islands of Hawaii, "the gems of the Pacific," are to be forever a buttress and never to be a menace to that splendid section of our country whose shores, from Bering Strait to the northern boundary of Mexico, are washed by the surf billows of the Pacific. [Loud applause.]



DU 627

4

T<sub>3</sub>

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 019 944 348 3



Hollinger Corp.  
pH 8.5